Salisbury University
Consortium Coordinating Committee meeting
October 6, 2016, 12 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Minutes

Present: Teri Herberger and Matt Hill, Co-Chairs (Co-Chairs, Staff Senate); Stephen Ford (President, Faculty Senate); William Barron (President, Graduate Student Council); Julia Howell (President, SGA); Tim Robinson (Adjunct Faculty Caucus); Amy Hasson (Chief of Staff, President's Office); Gina Boobar (President's Office)

Naming of 2016-2017 Chair
Teri Herberger and Matt Hill were named the 2016-2017 Co-Chairs, per the bylaws which state that the Staff Senate representative will chair the Coordinating Committee in odd fiscal years.

Report from Faculty Senate – Stephen Ford
- o They have had four meetings so far, including one special meeting.
- o Shared Governance Survey (unfinished business from last year) – This survey is sent annually from the USM. The primary issue from SU was transparency for budgets. The Faculty Senate charged the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) with investigating. (Stephen will share the USM shared governance report with the Consortium Coordinating Committee members. Copy of report attached to minutes.)
- o Great Colleges to Work for Survey – The Faculty Senate charged the FWC with investigating this as well. (Stephen will share the survey results summary document with the Consortium Coordinating Committee members. Copy of document attached to minutes.)
- o New Academic Advising Center will open soon in the Blackwell Library building. The Faculty Senate felt the new academic advising proposal should have come in front of them, so they called a special meeting in order to talk about it.
- o They were informed of the SU Gull Card Plus One program by the Interim Vice President of Administration and Finance. Program description and benefits should be on the SU website soon.
- o This is the second year of the General Education review. A three year time period was anticipated for this process.
- o College of Health and Human Services – This proposal is in the early stages of discussion. How does it fit in? How will it work? Where would it be located? Does it make sense for SU?
- o The changes in federal regulations governing the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and the impact on SU were presented at the President's Advisory Team meeting. Because of lawsuits, implementation may be delayed. The current deadline is December 1, so this is a pressing issue.
- o They are addressing the issue of searching the Faculty Senate archives. With the help of SU's archivist, they are investigating the possibility of using the Institutional Repository SOAR@SU, which has a very nice search mechanism. The Faculty Senate would be used as a guinea pig for this project and the other governance bodies can utilize it as well.

The plan would be to transfer all Faculty Senate documents to SU's archivist once a year, probably in May.

Report from Adjunct Faculty Caucus – Tim Robinson
- o They are working with Associate Provost Rich Wilkins regarding the Affordable Care Act and its impact on adjunct faculty. They have not gotten anything definitive yet.
- o They are working out an issue with parking passes. Currently in many cases, adjunct faculty cannot purchase discounted parking passes. Hopefully there will be a favorable change for next year.
- o It is very difficult to find adjunct faculty to volunteer to serve on the consortium committees.

Report from Staff Senate – Teri Herberger and Matt Hill
- o They have only held a couple of meetings so far, and they have received reports at those meetings (budget process changes, FLSA changes, etc.), so they have not had a chance to get to any new business.
- o They have been primarily concerned with the FLSA issue, but if the deadline has been moved the issue will not be as urgent.
- o They will be pushing for nominations for the Board of Regents' Staff award.

Report from Student Government Association – Julia Howell
- o They are rewriting their constitution; trying to create three equal branches.
- o They are drafting a bereavement policy, which they have discussed with Stephen Ford.
- o They are working on bridging the gap between downtown Salisbury and the University.
  - • SGA members will be going downtown to help with the Treat Street Halloween trick-or-treat event.
  - • Looking into possibilities for downtown housing for students.
- o They are working on developing a new event for the spring semester – "Be the Difference."
- o They are addressing the fact that there are no feminine hygiene dispensers in any of the academic buildings. They plan to speak with Eric Berkheimer about this matter.
- o They are trying to get Hungry Minds and Rise Up Coffee in the Academic Commons to extend their hours. They have contacted Owen Rosten about this issue.
- o They are trying to utilize the Green Fund in order to get reusable bags for the I Love Salisbury event to use for leaves and yard waste.
- o They are partnering with the Political Science Department for the Spring SGA elections.
- o They are trying to get weekly speakers to be assigned to the same day, time, and place every week, so students know when and where to go if they are interested in attending.

Report from Graduate Student Council – William Barron
- o They are also rewriting their constitution; adding information to help the Executive Council transition from year-to-year.
- o They are developing new positions for Assembly members, including one for on-line only learning (person would telecommute into meetings), and one for distance learning.
- o They are trying to organize a graduate student orientation.

Consortium Committees
- A bylaw amendment proposal was submitted by the Cultural Diversity and Inclusion Committee. The Consortium Coordinating Committee members will review the proposal, as well as look at the membership of all the consortium committees.

Other
- The group agreed to have all documents which are shared among the governance bodies be posted on SU's Campus Governance website.

Meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Recorder: Gina Boobar

Report from the Council of University System Faculty
Chair's Report on Shared Governance
June, 2016

This report takes a thematic approach to examine the state of shared governance at each of the 12 USM institutions. The primary sources for this report are the Chair's survey, two meetings of CUSF with the senate chairs, and the 10-minute talk given by each Senate Chair during the CUSF meeting at that campus.

The survey was distributed to each Senate in May 2016. Some institutions have circulated the survey widely among faculty and others have distributed it to their full Senates or their Senates' executive committees. Still other surveys were completed by the Senate Chairs alone. The survey questions are reproduced below and throughout the paper for reference purposes. Each uses a scale of strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree or non-applicable.

1. Shared governance on our campus is alive and healthy.
2. There are excellent communications and consultation by the administration with the faculty and senate leadership.
3. The faculty senate plays an important role in making academic decisions at the university.
4. The faculty senate plays an important role in making administrative decisions at the university.
5. Other than on rare occasions, the President rarely overturns faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility.
6. The President seeks meaningful faculty input on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.
7. The President supports and advocates the principles of shared governance.
8. The President supports and advocates the principles of shared governance at the subunit level also (eg. college, department).
9. The administration is supportive of faculty involvement in shared governance.
10. The administration utilizes faculty involvement in the areas of planning and strategic planning.
11. The administration recognizes faculty involvement in budgeting and fiscal resource planning.
12. The administration recognizes faculty involvement in academic affairs and program development.
13. The administration recognizes faculty involvement in staff selection and hiring.
14. Structures and processes that allow for shared governance are clearly defined in the governance document (eg. faculty handbook).
15. Shared governance between administration and faculty functions in an effective manner.

16. Joint decision making and shared governance discussed in questions 9 – 14 are practiced at the sub-unit levels also (eg. college, department).

The findings from the survey are summarized below into themes. For each theme excerpts from the survey have been included to provide context for the analysis that is presented. The excerpts are not meant to be representative in nature nor can they be generalized to a larger group of faculty leaders or faculty. Instead they tap into USM faculty leadership's perspectives on the unique and dynamic status of shared governance on USM campuses.

In this report the term "Faculty Senate" (sometimes abbreviated as "FS") is monolithically used to describe the faculty component of shared governance regardless of the variations in structure that differ from campus to campus. Similarly, this report uses the term "Senate Chair" universally with the understanding that some universities use the term "Senate President" and variations thereof.

Climate for Governance

Table I: *Shared governance on our campus is alive and healthy (Item 1).*
Survey Responses [n=12]

	SA-[n/%]	A-[n/%]	D-[n/%]	SD-[n/%]	NA-[n/%]
BSU			X		
CSU		X			
FSU	X				
SU		X			
TU (n-160)	X=4/2.52	X=48/30.19	X=52/32.70	X=40/25.16	X=15/9.43
UB	X				
UMB (n-15)	X=2/13	X=10/67	X=3/20	X=0/0	X=0/0
UMBC	X				
UMCES	X				
UMCP/UMD		X			
UMES (n-87)	X=8%	X=40%	X=18%	X=16%	X=5%
UMUC		X			
Total	4/33	6/50	2/16	0/0	0/0

Note: UMES' response is reported in percentages only. Real numbers were unavailable at the time of this report.

The majority of institutions (10 out of 12) "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the statement that shared governance was "alive and healthy on their campus". For those that described their institutions as having a strong sense of shared governance, having a structure that allowed for open and routine dialogue amongst faculty leaders and administration was frequently mentioned. This often took the form of top administrators meeting with faculty regularly at faculty meetings or having steering committees in which faculty leaders were invited to participate. The following comments reflect examples of how universities institutionalized a climate of shared governance on their campus.

> UMBC: I am a regular member of the President's Council along with all the Vice Presidents and Deans. The President's Council meets twice a month. I am also a member of the UMBC budget Committee which meets once a month. As Chair of the Executive

Committee, I host the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Tea with the Senior Administration once a month, during which time we discuss matters of importance to faculty. As Faculty Senate President, I serve on the UMBC Strategic Planning Steering committee and the Middle States Accreditation Steering Committee. I also serve on the university Program Concept Group that makes decisions on new program proposals. Faculty Senate input is actively sought after by members of the Administration and taken seriously on our campus.

UB: Monthly Senate meetings with president and provost plus monthly pre-meetings with both.

CSU: They (President and Provost) have provided avenues for discourse…The President has and continues to put structures in place to facilitate shared governance, such as establish the President's Shared Governance Council and Student Success Council.

UMCES: Ex officio members of the Faculty Senate include the President, Vice President for Education, and Graduate Student and Faculty Research Assistant representatives. The FS Chair serves on the UMCES Administrative Council, which is comprised of staff representatives and the UMCES leadership.

Equally as important to having an infrastructure in place to support shared governance is the will and desire to ensure its implementation on campus. Admittedly less concrete then implementing a structure, administrators who consistently communicated through words and deeds an overall desire to take the perspectives of faculty and other key stakeholders into account over time earned the trust of faculty. CSU described it as being "open to faculty and staff suggestions and input" and "being receptive to new ideas" while UMBC recognized faculty input was "actively sought after" by administrators and "taken seriously". Similarly UMB discussed the inclusive nature of top administrators stating "there is a clear interest on the part of the administration in this topic" of shared governance.

Two institutions (BSU and TU) disagreed that shared governance is practiced consistently, the implication being that faculty morale and therefore, teaching and learning, are potentially harmed.

BSU: The higher-up administration appears convinced that shared governance is an act of mercy or good will towards the faculty; actually it works the other way around: the faculty share the governance with the administration. In effect, the faculty feel patronized.

TU: Responses indicated that the structures of shared governance could be stronger and that there is some skepticism among faculty regarding the commitment of the administration to shared governance. Some were quite clear that they feel shared governance has deteriorated at Towson over the past few years. This sentiment is echoed by the majority of the faculty on the Senate and by a lot of other faculty who've spoken to me [the Senate Chair] about it. Faculty would like to see shared governance strengthened at Towson; the fear is that otherwise the quality of the education we offer will fall into decline—perhaps already has begun to do so.

Ultimately, administrators who were inclusive and intentional about welcoming participation in the decision making process demonstrated their desire to operationalize shared governance on a

campus. When discussing the interactions between administration and faculty the FSU Faculty Senate Chair noted that one of his responsibilities is to attend a portion of the President's Executive Council meetings. This has given faculty the opportunity to have "voice earlier in the process." He states "Instead of being told of a decision, we are more likely to be able to share our thoughts before the decision is made." This comment highlights another factor that contributes to an effective climate of shared governance; and it is timing. Faculty act in an advisory capacity to administration and in order to carry out their responsibilities they must be included early in the decision making process. When they are routinely excluded and are not given opportunities to contribute and are informed of changes, the actions of administrators will generally be received as disingenuous and will not cultivate a climate of shared governance on the campus.

Summary: Many (10 out of 12) of the institutions described their campus as one where shared governance was practiced. Those campuses were most likely to have an internal structure that routinely promoted faculty involvement in the affairs of the institution. This took many forms from meeting regularly with the President's cabinet to top administrators serving as ex officio members on faculty senates. Schools with structures that facilitated open two-way dialogue were most likely to report strong shared governance. Another important factor that coincided with shared governance was an administrator's ability to establish a rapport with key stakeholders and to consistently implement, through words as well as deeds, their ongoing commitment to shared governance. When one or both elements were missing faculty were likely to disengage from the process and when left unaddressed over a significant period of time morale as well as productivity were most likely to suffer.

Institutional Communications:

Table II: *There are excellent communications and consultation by the administration with the faculty and Senate leadership (Item 2).*

Survey Responses [n=12]

	SA-[n/%]	A-[n/%]	D-[n/%]	SD-[n/%]	NA-[n/%]
BSU				X	
CSU	X				
FSU		X			
SU		X			
TU	X= 3/1.88	X=47/29.38	X=52/32.50	X=38/23.75	20/12.50
UB		X			
UMB (n-23)	X=2/ 13	X=9/60	X=3/20	X=1/7	0/0
UMBC	X				
UMCES	X				
UMCP/UMD		X			
UMES	X=7	X=37	X=27	X=11	X=5
UMUC		X			
Total	X=3/25	X=7/58	X=1/.08	X=1/.08	X=0

For most campuses that agreed that they have "excellent communications and consultation," they described a mixture of formal and informal channels of communication embedded in the

4

structure of the institution. Faculty at most of the institutions report that they and the administrators work systematically to encourage frequent communication. Several institutions indicate, however, that the administrators occasionally merely tell faculty about decisions after the fact, rather than including representative faculty in conversations before and during the decision making process. Finally, TU noted a desire to change the structure of shared governance and, in so doing, to improve communications across the university.

CSU: This new administration is demonstrating its commitment to building/rebuilding an environment where faculty are viewed as allies. Members of the administration have attended Faculty Senate Executive Council meetings and have met with the whole faculty on several occasions. The Provost meets regularly with the Faculty Senate Leadership and the President, to-date, has been nothing but responsive to faculty or the Faculty Senate Leadership's request to meet.

FSU: "The president and provost share a report followed by a question and answer session with the senate. This has worked very well to help the flow of information. There are times where decisions are simply made and told to us where we feel we should have had a more of an opportunity to share our perspectives and thoughts before the decision was made.

SU: There are many examples of consistent communication between administration, faculty senate leadership and the faculty in general. First, all Senate meetings are open. Second, the Senate officers meet regularly with the Provost. Third, the Senate President is a member of the President's Advisory Team. This group includes the President, the Vice-Presidents, the academic deans, and the leaders of campus governance groups (Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Student Government Association, and the Adjunct Faculty Caucus).

TU: Senators agreed that communication of Senate business needs to be much better, across the university. Students and staff expressed the desire to have greater representation on the Senate. These concerns may lead Towson to reorganizing their shared governance structure—perhaps considering the option of a Faculty Senate, since currently there is no university body of shared governance offering exclusively faculty representation.

UB: We are doing an assessment of shared governance at UB and communications appears to be an area that needs some strengthening.

UMB: Dr. Jarrell attends meetings regularly and updates the senators about issues of importance. [In some cases,] it seems that the Administration or the Deans of the schools inform the Faculty Senate of what has already been decided.

UMBC: The communications and consultation between the Administration and the Faculty Senate are in general very good. The Faculty Senate President is consulted frequently by the President of the university on matters of importance to the campus community (e.g., budget announcements, integrating adjunct faculty in shared governance, campus safety and climate).

UMCES: The UMCES President attends most FS meetings as ex officio and, as such, can respond immediately to questions and concerns raised at those meetings. These responses often generate action, such as implementing new UMCES-wide practices or revising UMCES policies. Issues of new USM and Federal Policies and policy compliance are shared directly with the faculty at FS or Academic Council meetings. Each UMCES unit conducts monthly faculty meetings, which reserve time for reports from the FS. FS minutes are posted on the UMCES website. Unit Directors serve as principal liaisons of information between the Executive Council and faculty.

UMCP: There has been some improvement in seeking out input and/or informing the Senate, but that is mostly after the decision has been decided upon.

Summary: Most universities defined "excellent communication" as having open formal and informal two-way lines of communication between Administration and faculty. However, an important area of communication that merits further attention is the effectiveness of communication between shared governance bodies and their constituents. The structure and process that some institutions have developed for this type of communication may serve as a model for other universities who have identified a weakness in this area.

When administrators incorporated the input of faculty into decision making, or when recommendations were unable to be approved outright, but salient rationales were provided, faculty recognized that their input was valued by the administrators. Conversely, when faculty input was apparently routinely ignored, even within an established communication structure, then continued communication was viewed as useless. When faculty were informed without being given the opportunity to influence decisions, or if there was an expectation to react with limited time to deliberate, opportunities for faculty buy-in were missed and a culture of insolence was cultivated.

Senate's Role

Table III: *The Faculty Senate plays an important role in making academic decisions at the university (Items 3).*
The Faculty Senate plays an important role in making administrative decisions at the university (Items 4).

Survey Responses [n=12]

	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
Item 3													
SA			X	X	8/5	X	1/7		X		11		4/33
A	X	X			53/33		6/40	X		X	47	X	7/41
D					36/22		7/47				13		1/.08
SD					28/17		0/0				9		0/0
NA					35/21		1/7				7		0/0
Item 4	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP	UMES	UMUC	Total
SA					8/5		1/7				11		0/0
A		X	X	X	53/33		7/47	X	X		36	X	9/75
D					36/22	X	7/47			X	33		2/16
SD	X				28/17		0/0				10		1/.08
NA					35/21		0/0				7		0/0

Several institutions answered these questions with fairly equal percentages of agreement and disagreement, indicating that there are mixed views about the strengths of the Senates in making academic and administrative decisions. According to the widely accepted AAUP statement on shared governance, faculty should play a primary role in decision making in academic areas. This appears to occur in some, but not all, of the USM institutions. In most of the cases where institutions provided equivocal responses, concern was reported regarding the actual influence of faculty input on decision making.

> BSU: The Faculty Senate makes every possible effort to impact the academic decisions at the university, but it does not often have an impact on the administrative decisions, even about academic matters.

> SU: The Faculty Senate's role in making administrative decisions is less certain [than on strictly academic matters, such as curriculum development]. The administration asks for Faculty Senate participation on administrative search committees. However, there have been times when the administration has made decisions without significant Senate input. Related to that, it seems relevant to observe here that while the Senate President is a member of the aforementioned President's Advisory Team, that group engages primarily in information sharing (certainly important and valuable) and less in decision making.

> UB: The Faculty Senate leadership is often consulted on administrative decisions and provides input, but the administrative decisions are those of university leadership.

> UMB: I think there is the potential for the faculty senate to play these roles, but it is not apparent that the senate is actually involved in academic and administrative decisions. I don't recall any situations where the senate has been called upon to make an academic decision. These are relegated to the Schools rather than centralized. The role of the faculty senate remains limited. I view the senate's role as a consultative body; and, the individual deans and schools, in conjunction with the President, are the decision making bodies.

> UMCES: Practically, most administrative decisions that influence regular faculty activities are made by UMCES Unit Directors. The degree of engagement of faculty in administrative decisions at this level varies according to the practices of individual Unit Directors. In general, Directors exhibit transparency in their decision-making through frequent faculty meetings, occasional faculty retreats, and "town-hall" sessions that involve the entire staff.

> UMCP: There is much room for improvement in terms of involving faculty in long-term academic planning, and directions. Most administrative decisions are the purview of the administration. Greater faculty involvement and improved transparency would be beneficial.

On the other hand, some institutions report transparent communication between administrators and faculty as well as authentic valuing of faculty input. It is not altogether clear, however, even in some of these cases, that the administrators are supporting faculty decisions.

CSU: The administration has demonstrated they value and welcome the Faculty Senate's input in making academic decisions and providing advice in some administrative matters. Recently, we have engaged in meetings where key issues and concerns have been tackled with transparency. The President and Provost have been clear that the faculty has jurisdiction over the curriculum and thus faculty makes the decisions in this area.

SU: Perhaps the best example of the Senate's role in making academic decisions is that the curriculum is, as it should be, the purview of the faculty. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is a committee of the Senate and while it does have some administrative members, they are non-voting. In addition, there are Faculty Senate committees that focus on assessment, academic policies, and general education review.

UMBC: At UMBC, all academic program approvals (e.g., Academic Program Reviews, new program proposals) are reviewed and voted on by the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate speaks on behalf of faculty in regards to faculty promotion and tenure, requirements for conferring academic degrees, and research and creative activities on campus.

Summary: Whereas the administrators at most of the institutions permit the Faculty Senate to provide input on academic and other matters, it remains unclear whether or not the input is given considerable weight in administrative decision making.

President's Role
Table IV (Items 5-8)

5. Other than on rare occasions, the president seldom overturns faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility (e.g., curriculum, tenure, and promotion, etc.
6. The President seeks meaningful faculty input on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.
7. The President supports and advocates the principles of shared governance.
8. The President supports and advocates the principles of shared governance at the subunit level also (eg. college, department).

Survey Responses [n=12]

	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
Item 5													
SA			X	X	5/3	X	6/40	X	X		12		5/41
A	X				30/18		7/47			X	28	X	5/41
D					54/33		0/0				12		1/.08
SD					35/22		0/0				10		0/0
NA		X			35/22		2/13				25		1/.08
Item 6	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
SA		X			14/8	X	3/20				6		2/16
A	X		X		61/38		8/53	X	X		24		6/41
D				X	26/16		4/27			X	26		3/25
SD					7/4		0/0				16		0/0
NA					51/32		0/0				15	X	1/.08
Item 7	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
SA		X	X	X	7/4	X	10/67	X	X		11	X	8/66
A	X				42/26		5/33			X	42		3/25
D					48/30		0/0				16		1/.08
SD					27/17		0/0				10		0/0
NA					33/21		0/0				8		0/0
Item 8	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
SA		X	X		6/3	X	4/27		X		13	X	5/41
A	X			X	58/36		10/67	X		X	34		7/58
D					41/25		0/0				19		0/0
SD					15/9		1/7				11		0/0
NA					38/24		0/0				10		0/0

SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; D-Disagree; SD-Strongly Disagree; NA-Not Applicable

Most USM institutions report that the president vocally supports and actually engages in shared governance:

> CSU: Dr. Thompson is open to faculty suggestions and recommendations, especially if they are based on facts, undergirded by data and supports the mission and the goals of the university. To date she has demonstrated her commitment to seeking meaningful faculty

input by establishing the President's Shared Governance Council and Student Success Council and just recently re-establishing the University Budget Advisory Committee, all of which have adequate faculty representation. Dr. Thompson has, in words and deeds, demonstrated her support and advocacy for the principles of shared governance on the cabinet and sub-unit levels.

FSU: President Bowling has been wonderful in his support for shared governance. There have been a number of times I have been in a meeting where a senior administer would say something in which I would think faculty should be a part, and before I could say anything the president would say, "seems like this is something that faculty should be involved with."

UMB: I really believe that the president is very open to the idea of shared governance and that he takes our input into consideration. President Perman's willingness to host the summer and fall joint faculty-staff senate meetings to define shared governance at the campus was an example of administrative support.

UMBC: Our President does an excellent job of communicating his strong commitment to principles of shared governance on our campus.

UMCES: President Boesch is a strong advocate of shared governance. He commits substantial time to interacting with faculty and staff through his regularly scheduled Executive and Academic Council Meetings, which he chairs, and the FS meetings, which he attends as an ex officio member. When tension and inconsistencies arise between units, the President has worked with the FS and the Executive Council to resolve important issues.

On the other hand, several institutions (BSU, SU, and UMCP) disagree that the president and other administrators engage in authentic shared governance.

BSU: The president is still operating under a no-confidence vote from approximately five years ago. In principle, the president advocates the principles of shared governance and the president supports the principles of shared governance at the subunit level. He retains the right to make decisions, after listening to all parties. This is his right as president. The area in which the faculty currently have the most trouble with the president is in his decision making regarding the provost, who received a no-confidence vote in December 2015. The provost is the person who *routinely* overturns faculty decisions.

UMCP: In general, I believe the President supports and advocates the principles of shared governance. It is the adherence to and practice that needs to be improved upon.

Whereas there is general agreement about top administrators' engagement in shared governance, many institutional faculty have concerns about subunit shared governance.

UMB: The President has made a big effort to include faculty in decision making, this does not necessarily trickle down to all of the schools. Some have great shared governance (e.g. SOP), others less so (e.g. SOM). At the subunit level, there are well known pockets of inadequate shared governance that have not been addressed, such as

10

the lack of meaningful shared governance at the medical and dental schools.

Summary: At several institutions, there is a clear perception that the Presidents and other administrators are operating in good faith with the faculty, consistent with the principles of shared governance. Faculty at other institutions continue to perceive the President and the administration as lacking true commitment to shared governance implementation, instead adhering to it in name only. In most institutions, some concerns have been raised as to the inconsistency across units of engagement of faculty through shared governance.

Faculty's Role

Table V:
The Administration is supportive of faculty involvement in shared governance (ITEM 9).

Survey Responses [n=12]

	SA-[n/%]	A-[n/%]	D-[n/%]	SD-[n/%]	NA-[n/%]
BSU			X		
CSU	X				
FSU	X				
SU	X				
TU	X=7/4.52	X=43/27.74	38/24.52	23/14.84	44/28.39
UB	X				
UMB	X= 6/40	X= 9/60	X= 0/0	X= 0/0	X= 0/0
UMBC	X				
UMCES	X				
UMCP/UMD		X			
UMES	X=9	X=48	X=15	X=10	X=5
UMUC	X				
Total	7/58	3/25	1/08.33	0/0	1/.08

Almost all institutions reported strong agreement that the administration supports faculty engagement in shared governance. There is some indication, as noted above, that this is less true at subunit levels. Concerns are also noted about administrators' informing faculty of decisions after the fact. Finally, some institutions noted the necessity that faculty consistently contribute their effort and time into committee service in order to ensure that the faculty voice is heard on important matters.

FSU: This is most strongly demonstrated by the President, at some of the other levels, not as much.

UMB: The faculty are routinely included in committees and groups. Shared governance within schools is school dependent.

UMBC: The Administration is supportive of faculty involvement in shared governance but there are some decisions that we hear about after they have been made.

11

UMCP: Administrative support for shared governance is improving, however there is still a long way to go. This is not something that the President and administrators can do alone. Faculty must go beyond their immediate areas of responsibilities, teaching, and research and actively participate in our shared governance processes.

One institution (BSU) disagreed that the faculty's role in shared governance is supported by the administration. It is asserted that the administrators vocalize support for faculty involvement, but that they do not in fact, act in accord with what they say about the matter. Faculty perceive that the provost, i.e., the administrator charged with making most of the academic decisions, disrespects and disregards their proposals and recommendations.

BSU: In theory, yes, the administration wants to look supportive of faculty involvement in shared governance, but in practice, the provost routinely disagrees with the input of the Faculty Senate. This provides the impression of exclusion of our opinions by the provost. Many examples to support this point of view exist in the report that the Faculty Senate chair submitted to the president (and later shared with Chancellor Caret) to support the no-confidence vote on the provost.

Summary: There is agreement at almost all institutions that shared governance is firmly in place at the presidential level, and less so at the level of other administrators. Subunit shared governance appears, as has been the case in the past, to be highly inconsistent.

Joint Decision-Making

Table VI
ITEMS 10-14:

10. The administration utilizes faculty involvement in the area of planning and strategic planning.
11. The administration recognizes faculty involvement in budgeting and fiscal resource planning.
12. The administration recognizes faculty involvement in academic affairs and program development.
13. The administration recognizes faculty involvement in staff selection and hiring.
14. Structures and processes that allow for shared governance are clearly defined in the governance document (e.g., faculty handbook).

Survey Responses [n=12]

	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
Item 10													
SA				X	8/5	X	3/20	X	X		14		4/33
A	X	X	X		58/36		11/73			X	45	X	8/66
D					46/29		1/7				13		0/0
SD					29/18		0/0				9		0/0
NA					16/10		0/0				6		0/0
Item 11	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
SA					6/3		0/0				3		0/0
A		X	X	X	44/28	X	10/67	X			21		6/50
D	X				46/29		5/33		X	X	24		5/41
SD					38/24		0/0				23		
NA					23/14		0/0				16	X	1/.08
Item 12	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
SA		X	X	X	1/.64	X	3/20	X	X		16	X	7
A	X				32/20		10/67			X	42		4
D					43/27		2/13				16		0/0
SD					46/29		0/0				7		1/.08
NA					35/22		0/0				6		0/0
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
Item 13													
SA		X	X	X	9/5		0/0		X		15		4/33
A					82/51		13/93	X		X	38	X	6/50
D	X				32/20		1/7				15		1/.08
SD					20/12		0/0				14		0/0
NA						X	0/0				5		1/.08
Item 14	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
SA			X	X	12/7	X	2/14	X	X		12		5/41
A	X	X			69/43		12/86			X	45	X	7/58
D					33/21		0/0				10		0/0
SD					23/14		0/0				7		0/0
NA					20/12		0/0				13		0/0

Table VI A
ITEMS 15-16:

15. Shared governance between administration and faculty functions in an effective manner.
16. Joint decision making and shared governance discussed in questions 9 – 14 are practiced at the sub-unit levels also (e.g., college, department).

Survey Responses [n=12]

	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
Item 15													
SA					6/3		2/13		X		7		1/.08
A		X	X	X	63/40	X	11/73	X		X	36	X	10/75
D	X				42/27		2/13				22		1/.08
SD					16/10		0/0				14		0/0
NA					28/18		0/0				8		0/0
Item 16	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCES	UMCP/UMD	UMES	UMUC	Total
SA				X	2/1		1/7		X		12		2/16
A	X	X	X		40/25	X	6/43			X	45	X	8/66
D		X			52/33		5/36				11		2/16
SD					37/23		1/7				9		0/0
NA					25/16		1/7	X			10		1/.08

There is agreement at most institutions on items in this set of questions that relate to planning and to personnel selection and hiring.

> BSU: Faculty are always asked to participate with the administration in strategic planning, and have representation on the president's budget advisory body.

> CSU: The administration has been intentional in utilizing faculty involvement in planning, especially in the Academic Affairs area as exhibited by the continued support of our longstanding Academic Affairs Strategic Planning Committee. By ensuring faculty representation on the newly re-established University Budget Advisory Committee and the current six or seven search committees, the administration demonstrates its commitment to ensuring faculty's input in the decision making process in such critical areas as budget and hiring.

> UMCES: UMCES faculty is directly involved in strategic planning. Indeed strategic themes in the last UMCES Strategic Plan were all derived from faculty input, arising from a past UMCES Convocation. UMCES and MEES academic programs are largely bottom-up with faculty providing the bulk of strategic decisions. Faculty members routinely participate in hiring key staff at UMCES Center Administration, particularly those related to sponsored programs.

Even within institutions in which administrators in some of these areas engage in genuine shared governance, there is occasionally concern that faculty input is not considered seriously within other domains.

> BSU: Re. academic program development: The faculty handbook indicates the extent to

which faculty should participate in program development and academic affairs. We do have concern that the faculty voice may not be considered primary in any future discussions/decisions relating to retrenchment, based upon a recent statement by the provost on this matter. We will withhold judgment, however, until we have the opportunity to investigate this matter more fully. Re. hiring: It is customary that faculty actively participate in hiring committee activities, but there have been a couple recent cases in which the faculty voice has been rejected.

FSU: We have a rather limited role in the area of Budget, mostly it is made by administration and then shown to the key faculty committee.

UB: Faculty are actively involved in developing strategic plans at the college and university level. More involvement by faculty in planning, marketing and communications would be appreciated.

UMCES: President Boesch has demonstrated consistency in faculty evaluations and promotions, critically reviewing faculty performance but following guidance from faculty and director recommendations. Most day-to-day budgetary decisions lie with unit directors. While decisions are made apparent by UMCES leadership, fiscal planning and decision-making does not directly involve faculty input. There are categories of strategic budget planning, which could benefit from increased faculty input.

UMBC: While faculty provides input in budgetary matters, budgetary decisions are largely made by the Administration.

In addition, concern was voiced once again by some institutions with regard to inconsistent levels of engagement in shared governance at subunit levels.

FSU: For item 16, colleges and levels of sub-units differ in their level of share governance and joint decision making.

UMB: As stated before, sub-units (medicine, dentistry) really need to address the lack of governance. There is great variation between the colleges; so, one blanket statement does not fit all colleges.

UMCES: At the unit level, faculty are often but not always involved in hiring key staff. As indicated previously, decision-making and shared governance at the unit level is not so strictly defined through policy or practice and depends on the leadership styles of individual unit directors. Still, all units share regular faculty meetings and similar functional committees, which serve to distribute some administrative duties and decision-making.

Summary: Most faculty identify that shared governance principles are implemented in at least some domains at their institutions. The inconsistency, however, among domains in which they are and are not engaged continues to indicate that there is still important work to be done. Consistent with prior findings in this report, difficulties implementing shared governance were most likely to be seen in budget decision making and at the sub-unit level within the institution.

Recommendations:

- Issues of shared governance can languish on for extended periods of time and negatively impact an institution's ability to function. Therefore, it is recommended when unresolved concerns emerge that create an impasse between administration and faculty, that a joint corrective action plan be developed. This plan, at a minimum, would consist of a statement of the issues to be addressed, how they will be addressed, the responsible parties, and the expected timelines for addressing them. A third neutral party would be mutually selected to serve as mediator to assist in the facilitation of the development and execution of the plan. This strategy can be implemented at any academic unit or subunit where a breakdown in shared governance has occurred to an extreme degree and/or for an extended period of time or an impasse was unable to be resolved.

- Faculty Senates may consider initiating an internal review of units or subunits to gain an understanding of the areas of conflict, breakdowns in communication, and processes that are ineffective and inefficient, and then identify the differences that may exist relating to the definition of shared governance among faculty and administration. Disseminate findings to administrators, faculty and to the President. Where appropriate, develop action plans based on the data.

- Faculty Senates should conduct annual evaluations of top administrators. Issues such as the degree of influence faculty have over the academic and administrative decision making processes as well as issues of transparency should be openly discussed.

- Institute a Board of Regents shared governance award to underscore their commitment to the process.

- Sponsor annual system-wide workshop/trainings for subunit administrators on implementing and strengthening shared governance.

Salisbury
UNIVERSITY

The Chronicle 2015 *Great Colleges to Work For*

Salisbury University

Results Summary

Presented by SU Human Resources Office

Based on Modern Think Higher Education Insight Survey©

November 6, 2015

Contents

Program Background

The Chronicle *Great Colleges to Work For* program is designed to recognize colleges and universities that have been successful in creating great workplaces and to further research and understand the factors, dynamics and influences that have the most impact on organizational culture at higher education institutions.

The core of the program is a two-part assessment process, comprised of a Faculty/Staff survey and an institutional audit.

The Faculty/Staff survey (The Modern Think Higher Education Insight Survey©) was sent to almost 114,000 faculty and staff nationwide. About 44,000 responses were received: 16,347 faculty; 12,911 exempt professionals; 6,261 non-exempt staff; 1,149 adjunct faculty; and 7,308 administrators.

The institutional audit (The Modern Think Institution Questionnaire© or IQ) captures information detailing various institution demographics, policies and practices.

Recognition is primarily determined through the feedback provided by Faculty/Staff and collected from the survey. For analysis and recognition purposes, participating schools are segmented into four-year and two-year categories. Schools within each of these categories are further classified into three groups based on student enrollment.

Dimensions Overview

The survey is comprised of 60 statements in 15 Dimensions designed to assess key dynamics and relationships that are influencing Salisbury University's culture and performance. In the survey, Faculty and Staff were asked to respond to each statement using a five-point rating scale:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Sometimes Agree/Sometimes Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Additionally, there is a Not Applicable response option.

The survey instrument also includes an 18-item benefits satisfaction component, 15 optional demographics and two open-ended questions.

Dimensions
- Job Satisfaction/Support
- Teaching Environment
- Professional Development
- Compensation, Benefits & Work/Life Balance
- Facilities
- Policies, Resources & Efficiency
- Shared Governance

- Pride
- Supervisors/Department Chairs
- Senior Leadership
- Faculty, Administration & Staff Relations
- Communication
- Collaboration
- Fairness
- Respect & Appreciation

Open-Ended Questions
1. What do you appreciate most about working at this institution?
2. What would make this institution a better place to work?

Definitions

Institution refers to the entire Salisbury University.

SU's Survey Category as a four-year school, based on enrollment is Medium (3,000 to 9,999 students).

Department refers to your most immediate workgroup or team.

Senior Leadership refers to the most senior members of the institution (e.g. President, Provost, Vice Presidents, and Deans).

Supervisors/Department Chair refers to the individual to whom you directly report.

A percent Positive response is the percentage of Faculty and Staff who responded by "Strongly Agree" or "Agree." A percent Negative response is the percentage who responded with "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree." Based on the survey benchmarks, the percent Positive and Negative results can be interpreted as follows:

Percent Positive Score	Percent Negative Score
65%-75%+ = Good	< 10-14% = Good
55%-64% = Fair	15%-19% = Fair
< 54% = Poor	20%+ = Poor

Report Overviews

Topline Report - Color coded report shows at a glance how your institution scored overall, where your strengths lay, where barriers exist, and how you compare with your peers.

Topline by Job Category Report - Shows both the overall Positive responses (percent who Strongly Agree or Agree) and the date broken out by each job category.

Job Category Benchmark Report - Provides overall Positive/Negative response rates for each survey statement and overall benchmark columns for Honor Roll and Carnegie Classification. From there, you can compare the percent Positive data for each job category against the two columns of benchmark data.

Year-to-Year Scorecard - See your current and previous year's Positive and Negative survey results side-by-side. This color-coded ScoreCard helps identify the areas where you are moving in the right direction as well as those in which there is still room for improvement. This comparison is for Overall Results only.

General Demographics by Job Category - Individual General Demographic Spreadsheets provided for each job category surveyed at your school. Each spreadsheet contains data by: Gender, Age, Ethnicity/Race, Relationship Status, Annual Salary, Job Status, Years at Institution, Supervisory Status.

Employee Comments Report – Faculty and Staff are asked two open-ended questions. This report provides their responses exactly as written. To enhance analysis, the comments are sorted by job category.

Survey Period

The Great Colleges to Work For reports were generated from the data collected during the survey period of March 16 - April 13, 2015. All survey responses were submitted directly to Modern Think who analyzed the data and then provided these reports to Salisbury University.

Salisbury University Response Rate

The response rate for the Faculty and Staff survey:

- Surveys Distributed (Random sampling of staff/faculty): 600
- Survey Responses: 302
- Response Rate: 50.3%

A 50.3% response was well above the average response rate of 39% for participating institutions.

Response Distribution

Please note that survey respondents <u>self-selected</u> their job category, therefore, the respondents for a particular survey job category may not match SU's formal definition for that job category.

Job Category	Respondent Percentage	Number of Respondents
Administration	14%	45
Faculty	47%	144
Exempt Professional Staff	23%	71
Non-Exempt Staff	10%	31
Unspecified	3%	11

SU's Survey Results Summary

Topline Report Highlights

Scoring chart:

Poor	Warrants Attention	Fair to Mediocre	Good	Very Good to Excellent
0%-44%	45%-54%	55%-64%	65%-74%	75%-100%

- Overall survey average of 70% as compared with:
    - Honor Roll institutions at 78%
    - Carnegie Master's at 67%
- Overall survey average of 70% by Job Category:
    - 80% Administration
    - 65% Faculty
    - 74% Exempt
    - 73% Non-exempt
- Strongest dimensions:
    - 81% Supervisors/Department Chairs
    - 79% Facilities
    - 78% Pride
    - 75% Teaching Environment
    - 75% Professional Development
- Greatest opportunities for improvement:
    - 62% Senior Leadership
    - 62% Faculty/Administration/Staff Relations
    - 62% Communication
    - 64% Collaboration

Year-to-Year Scorecard Report Highlights
- 2015 compared to 2014 overall shows relatively no changes
- 3% increases in average Positive responses for:
    - Teaching environment
    - Comp/benefits & work/life balance
    - Supervisors/Department Chairs
- 2% decreases in average Positive responses for:
    - Fairness
    - Collaboration
    - Faculty/Administration/Staff relations

Job Category Benchmark Report Highlights

- Overall results as compared to other Carnegie Master's Institutions:
  - On par or better than the comparison group
- Overall results as compared to Honor Roll Institutions:
  - Strongest Positive comparative Dimensions
    - Supervisors/Department Chairs
    - Facilities
    - Shared governance
  - Greatest opportunities for improvement in Dimensions
    - Senior Leadership
    - Faculty/Administration/Staff relations
  - Greatest opportunity for improvement in a job category
    - Faculty

Employee Comments Report Theme Highlights

Administration	Exempt Professional Staff
+ Colleagues	+ Benefits
- Funding and staffing	+ Students
	+ Professionalism
	+ Respect
Faculty Themes	- Staffing
+ Work-life balance	- Salaries
+ Colleagues	
+ Academic freedom	**Non-Exempt Staff**
- Senior Leadership	+ Benefits
- Salaries	- Flexibility with work schedules
- Staffing	- Opportunity for advancement
	- Staffing

General Demographics Highlights

With respect to the additional detail data purchased for 2015, the statistical value of this data is dependent on the participant's willingness to self-disclose. Within the 4 job categories with respect to declination to disclose:

- Nonexempt participants were more likely to self-disclose
- Administration declination averaged 20%
- Exempt Professional staff declination averaged 15%
- Nonexempt staff declination averaged 10%
- Faculty declination averaged 20%

The one exception to this was for the Years at Institution factor for which the highest job category declination was 7%.

General Demographics by Job Category Chart for Years at Institution

Overall Survey Score	Years at Institution								
	< 2 yrs	2-4 yrs	5-7 yrs	8-10 yrs	11-15 yrs	16-20 yrs	21-25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Declined
Adminstration	80%	79%	83%			75%		82%	
Exempt	70%	83%	76%	76%	64%	68%			
Nonexempt	79%			60%				78%	
Faculty	73%	75%	71%	58%	58%	70%	50%	74%	51%

8

SU's Survey Results Summary Detail

Scoring chart:

Poor	Warrants Attention	Fair to Mediocre	Good	Very Good to Excellent
0%-44%	45%-54%	55%-64%	65%-74%	75%-100%

Job Category Benchmark Report

For the most part, SU's results by Dimension were not derived from compelling overall question and/or job category responses. There are two exceptions:

- Overall Very Good to Excellent Score and no individual question or job category scored Below Good:
  - Facilities
  - Supervisors/Department Chairs

Although the next few Dimensions resulted in an overall Good or Above score, and no individual question scored Below Good, one or more job categories scored Below Good:

- Teaching Environment
  - Overall Very Good to Excellent
  - Faculty scored 2/3 questions as Fair to Mediocre

- Professional Development
  - Overall Very Good to Excellent
  - Nonexempt scored one question as Fair to Mediocre

- Shared Governance
  - Overall Good
  - Faculty and Nonexempt staff scored one question as Fair to Mediocre

The below Dimensions resulted in an overall Good or Above score; however, one or more questions scored Mediocre or Below:

- Job Satisfaction/Support
  - Overall Good (73%)
  - Resources – Warrants Attention (52%)

- Compensation, Benefits & Work/Life Balance
  - Overall Good (74%)
  - Pay – Warrants Attention (47%)

- Policies, Resources & Efficiency
  - Overall Good (66%)
  - Adequate faculty/staff – Poor (28%)

- Pride
    - Overall Very Good to Excellent (78%)
    - Institution's culture is special – Fair to Mediocre (64%)

- Fairness
    - Overall Good (68%)
    - Promotions based on ability (64%)
    - Low performance is addressed – Fair to Mediocre (55%)

- Respect & Appreciation
    - Overall Good (68%)
    - Regularly Recognized – Fair to Mediocre (58%)
    - Meaningful recognition and rewards program – Warrants Attention (47%)

The final group of Dimensions resulted in a Less than overall Good score, and nearly all or all questions, as well as multiple Job Categories scored Below Good:

- Senior Leadership (62%)
    - 2 of 6 questions had Good scores
    - 4 of 6 questions had Fair to Mediocre scores
    - Faculty scored all questions Below Mediocre
    - Exempt and Nonexempt had a few Fair to Mediocre scores

- Faculty, Administration & Staff Relations (62%)
    - 2 of 2 questions scored Fair to Mediocre
    - Faculty scored both as Fair to Mediocre
    - Exempt staff scored one Fair to Mediocre

- Communication (62%)
    - 1 of 4 questions scored Good
    - 3 of 4 questions scored Fair to Mediocre
    - Faculty scored all questions below Mediocre
    - Administration, Exempt, and Nonexempt had a few below Mediocre scores

- Collaboration (64%)
    - 2 of 4 questions scored Good
    - 2 of 4 questions scored Warrants Attention to Mediocre
    - Administration, Exempt, Nonexempt and Faculty each had one or more scores below Mediocre

Below is a quick reference view of the low scoring questions by job category:

The Chronicle Great Colleges to Work For 2015
Job Category Low Positive Chart

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

Survey Questions	Admin	Exempt	Nonexempt	Faculty
My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals	37%	28%	25%	25%
Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me	61%	59%	56%	36%
Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented	62%	50%	58%	54%
There is a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution	64%	63%	61%	45%
I am paid fairly for my work		41%	58%	40%
I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job	60%	50%		46%
I am regularly recognized for my contributions		59%	51%	53%
Issues of low performance are addressed in my department		60%	51%	50%
Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future		61%	61%	45%
When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered		63%	64%	56%
Promotions in my department are based on a person's ability		62%	37%	
There is regular and open communication among faculty, administration and staff		64%		52%
I can count on people to cooperate across departments			56%	53%
Our orientation program prepares new faculty, administration and staff to be effective	61%		58%	
I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear of harming my career		60%		59%
Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters		64%		55%
Faculty, administration and staff are meaningfully involved in institutional planning			62%	58%
Our review process accurately measures my job performance			54%	
Senior leadership shows a genuine interest in the well-being of faculty, administration and staff				46%
I believe what I am told by senior leadership				49%
This institution is well run				54%
This institution's culture is special –something you don't find just anywhere				54%
I understand the necessary requirements to advance my career			58%	
We have opportunities to contribute to important decisions in my department			58%	
Senior leadership regularly models this institution's values				55%
At this institution, we discuss and debate issues respectfully to get better results				56%
Our senior leadership has the knowledge, skills and experience necessary for institutional success				57%
Faculty, administration and staff work together to ensure the success of institution programs and initiatives				58%
There is a good balance of teaching, service and research at this institution				61%
There is appropriate recognition of innovative and high quality teaching				62%
This institution's policies and practices ensure fair treatment for faculty, administration and staff				62%
In my department, we communicate openly about issues that impact each other's work				63%

General Demographics by Job Category for Years at Institution Report
Below is a quick reference view of the low scoring questions by job category and years at institution.

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

Areas of Interest		Years at Institution								
		< 2 yrs	2-4 yrs	5-7 yrs	8-10 yrs	11-15 yrs	16-20 yrs	21-25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Declined
My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals.	Admin	42%	50%	20%			44%		0%	
	Exempt	33%	41%	33%	14%	14%	28%			
	NonEx	40%			33%				16%	
	Faculty	43%	42%	20%	13%	21%	29%	18%	30%	0%
Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me.	Admin	66%	75%	80%			66%		33%	
	Exempt	56%	81%	50%	42%	42%	57%			
	NonEx	60%			40%				66%	
	Faculty	50%	42%	40%	18%	36%	56%	18%	35%	12%
Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented.	Admin	57%	62%	60%			55%		83%	
	Exempt	38%	58%	58%	71%	28%	42%			
	NonEx	80%			16%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	71%	70%	45%	47%	41%	54%	70%	12%
There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution.	Admin	71%	62%	60%			55%		66%	
	Exempt	55%	91%	50%	57%	57%	71%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	62%	50%	40%	31%	42%	64%	18%	50%	25%

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

Areas of Interest		Years at Institution								
		< 2 yrs	2-4 yrs	5-7 yrs	8-10 yrs	11-15 yrs	16-20 yrs	21-25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Declined
I am paid fairly for my work.	Admin	85%	87%	80%			33%		50%	
	Exempt	61%	33%	41%	28%	28%	0%			
	NonEx	60%			66%				83%	
	Faculty	75%	64%	50%	22%	10%	52%	36%	45%	12%
I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job.	Admin	71%	62%	60%			44%		83%	
	Exempt	38%	66%	66%	57%	42%	42%			
	Faculty	56%	42%	50%	40%	36%	52%	36%	55%	37%
I am regularly recognized for my contributions.	Admin	100%	75%	80%			55%		66%	
	Exempt	55%	50%	66%	85%	42%	57%			
	NonEx	60%			66%				33%	
	Faculty	62%	71%	60%	40%	42%	58%	54%	55%	37%
Issues of low performance are addressed in my department.	Admin	42%	62%	80%			75%		66%	
	Exempt	50%	58%	66%	71%	33%	71%			
	NonEx	75%			33%				60%	
	Faculty	53%	78%	70%	27%	42%	37%	20%	70%	50%
Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future.	Admin	57%	62%	60%			77%		66%	
	Exempt	61%	75%	75%	57%	28%	57%			
	Faculty	62%	50%	50%	31%	21%	47%	45%	65%	25%
When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered.	Admin	100%	87%	80%			55%		100%	
	Exempt	61%	83%	75%	71%	42%	42%			
	NonEx	60%			33%				66%	
	Faculty	68%	78%	70%	50%	42%	58%	54%	55%	37%

General Demographics by Job Category for Years at Institution Report (continued)

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

Areas of Interest		< 2 yrs	2-4 yrs	5-7 yrs	8-10 yrs	11-15 yrs	16-20 yrs	21-25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Declined
Promotions in my department are based on a person's ability.	Admin	71%	100%	100%			88%		50%	
	Exempt	42%	70%	77%	50%	50%	66%			
	NonEx	50%			50%				80%	
	Faculty	56%	78%	80%	54%	73%	70%	36%	85%	50%
There is regular and open communication among faculty, administration and staff.	Admin	71%	57%	80%			50%		83%	
	Exempt	52%	75%	58%	71%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	85%	70%	36%	42%	52%	27%	55%	37%
I can count on people to cooperate across departments.	Admin	71%	62%	100%			44%		66%	
	Exempt	58%	75%	50%	42%	57%	57%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				50%	
	Faculty	62%	71%	60%	40%	42%	58%	50%	75%	25%
Our orientation program prepares new faculty, administration and staff to be effective.	Admin	66%	60%	80%			33%		0%	
	Exempt	58%	63%	100%	28%	75%	80%			
	NonEx	50%			60%				66%	
	Faculty	56%	85%	60%	72%	70%	73%	37%	81%	50%
I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear.	Exempt	61%	75%	66%	71%	28%	57%			
	NonEx	60%			66%				66%	
	Faculty	50%	57%	60%	63%	57%	64%	36%	80%	37%
Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters.	Admin	71%	62%	60%			66%		83%	
	Exempt	50%	75%	66%	57%	57%	71%			
	NonEx	60%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	78%	40%	45%	42%	58%	45%	60%	50%
Faculty, administration and staff are meaningfully involved in institutional planning.	Exempt	52%	100%	83%	85%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	75%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	78%	60%	40%	47%	70%	45%	65%	37%

General Demographics by Job Category for Years at Institution Report (continued)

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

Areas of Interest		< 2 yrs	2-4 yrs	5-7 yrs	8-10 yrs	11-15 yrs	16-20 yrs	21-25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Declined
							Years at Institution			
Our review process accurately measures my job performance.	Admin	50%	87%	100%			55%		50%	
	Exempt	76%	58%	66%	100%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	60%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	71%	70%	72%	73%	64%	54%	80%	50%
Sr leadership shows a genuine interest in the well-being of faculty, admin. & staff.	Admin	71%	75%	80%			66%		50%	
	Exempt	72%	80%	83%	57%	57%	57%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	75%	57%	30%	31%	36%	47%	36%	55%	25%
I believe what I am told by senior leadership.	Admin	57%	62%	80%			77%		100%	
	NonEx	60%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	62%	71%	40%	31%	42%	52%	27%	63%	37%
This institution is well run.	Admin	71%	62%	80%			66%		100%	
	Exempt	66%	91%	66%	57%	71%	85%			
	Faculty	75%	57%	40%	31%	52%	70%	36%	70%	37%
This institution's culture is special - something you don't find just anywhere.	Admin	71%	62%	40%			75%		100%	
	Exempt	58%	75%	75%	85%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	80%	71%	60%	27%	33%	76%	27%	70%	37%
I understand the necessary requirements to advance my career.	Admin	57%	87%	100%			66%		50%	
	Exempt	61%	83%	72%	71%	57%	57%			
	NonEx	40%			50%				100%	
	Faculty	87%	78%	90%	90%	84%	100%	81%	95%	37%
We have opportunities to contribute to important decisions in my department.	Exempt	44%	91%	66%	100%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	60%			33%				66%	
	Faculty	62%	85%	90%	72%	78%	82%	63%	80%	75%
Senior leadership regularly models this institution's values.	Exempt	83%	100%	91%	71%	71%	57%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	81%	64%	60%	50%	33%	52%	36%	60%	50%
At this institution, we discuss and debate issues respectfully to get better results.	Admin	71%	62%	60%			77%		50%	
	Exempt	50%	81%	75%	71%	28%	71%			
	NonEx	80%			40%				83%	
	Faculty	62%	64%	50%	50%	52%	70%	27%	60%	62%
Our Sr leadership has the knowledge, skills and experience necessary for success.	Admin	85%	62%	80%			100%		66%	
	NonEx	100%			50%				100%	
	Faculty	75%	71%	50%	45%	47%	52%	45%	70%	50%
Faculty, admin. & staff work together to ensure success of institution pgms & initiatives.	Admin	85%	87%	80%			55%		83%	
	Exempt	55%	91%	66%	71%	57%	71%			
	Faculty	81%	78%	50%	50%	52%	58%	36%	70%	25%
There is a good balance of teaching, service and research at this institution.	NonEx	100%			60%				80%	
	Faculty	62%	57%	70%	59%	57%	70%	36%	70%	75%
There is appropriate recognition of innovative and high quality teaching.	NonEx	100%			80%				0%	
	Faculty	87%	64%	90%	45%	63%	76%	36%	65%	25%
This institution's policies & practices ensure fair treatment for faculty, admin. and staff.	Admin	100%	87%	80%			55%		100%	
	Exempt	88%	91%	75%	71%	57%	71%			
	Faculty	81%	92%	80%	54%	57%	70%	18%	60%	25%
In my department, we communicate openly about issues that impact each other's work.	Admin	57%	100%	100%			88%		100%	
	Exempt	55%	75%	83%	100%	28%	57%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				100%	
	Faculty	62%	71%	80%	50%	68%	64%	27%	75%	75%

Detail by Job Category

Scoring chart:

Poor	Warrants Attention	Fair to Mediocre	Good	Very Good to Excellent
0%-44%	45%-54%	55%-64%	65%-74%	75%-100%

Following is an analysis of individual questions scoring Mediocre (64%) or lower is provided by job category:

Administration – 6 points of interest

- I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job (60%)
- My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals (37%)
- Our orientation program prepares new faculty, administration and staff to be effective (61%)
- Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented (62%)
- There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution (64%)
- Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me (61%)

Exempt Professional Staff – 14 points of interest

- I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job (50%)
- I am paid fairly for my work (41%)
- My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals (28%)
- Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future (61%)
- Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters (64%)
- There is regular and open communication among faculty, administration and staff (64%)
- Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented (50%)
- I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear of harming my career (60%)
- There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution (63%)
- When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered (63%)
- Promotions in my department are based on a person's ability (62%)
- Issues of low performance are addressed in my department (60%)
- I am regularly recognized for my contributions (59%)
- Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me (59%)

Non-exempt Staff – 16 points of interest

- I understand the necessary requirements to advance my career (58%)
- I am paid fairly for my work (58%)
- Our review process accurately measures my job performance (54%)
- My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals (25%)
- Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented (58%)
- Our orientation program prepares new faculty, administration and staff to be effective (58%)
- Faculty, administration and staff are meaningfully involved in institutional planning (62%)

- Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future (61%)
- We have opportunities to contribute to important decisions in my department (58%)
- I can count on people to cooperate across departments (56%)
- There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution (61%)
- When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered (64%)
- Promotions in my department are based on a person's ability (37%)
- Issues of low performance are addressed in my department (51%)
- I am regularly recognized for my contributions (51%)
- Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me (56%)

Faculty - 27 points of interest

- I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job (46%)
- There is a good balance of teaching, service and research at this institution (61%)
- There is appropriate recognition of innovative and high quality teaching (62%)
- I am paid fairly for my work (40%)
- My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals (25%)
- This institution is well run (54%)
- Faculty, administration and staff are meaningfully involved in institutional planning (58%)
- This institution's culture is special –something you don't find just anywhere (54%)
- Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future (45%)
- Our senior leadership has the knowledge, skills and experience necessary for institutional success (57%)
- Senior leadership shows a genuine interest in the well-being of faculty, administration and staff (46%)
- Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters (55%)
- Senior leadership regularly models this institution's values (55%)
- I believe what I am told by senior leadership (49%)
- Faculty, administration and staff work together to ensure the success of institution programs and initiatives (58%)
- There is regular and open communication among faculty, administration and staff (52%)
- When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered (56%)
- In my department, we communicate openly about issues that impact each other's work (63%)
- Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented (54%)
- At this institution, we discuss and debate issues respectfully to get better results (56%)
- I can count on people to cooperate across departments (53%)
- There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution (45%)
- I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear of harming my career (59%)
- Issues of low performance are addressed in my department (50%)

- This institution's policies and practices ensure fair treatment for faculty, administration and staff (62%)
- I am regularly recognized for my contributions (53%)
- Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me (36%)

Conclusions

The response rate was higher than average for this survey which assists in the value of the information reported. The campus, particularly the Faculty, want to make their voices heard. This year's data reflects improvement in a few areas and decline in a few other areas.

Facilities and Supervisor/Department Chairs are the strongest Positive Dimensions. With respect to Facilities, the respondents view the campus as safe and secure while meeting their needs. Supervisor/Department Chairs shine with ensuring expectations are clear, requesting and providing feedback, being trustworthy and a role model, fairness, consistency, and overall maintaining good working relationships.

Collaboration and collegiality from the Employee Comments Report were very good, particularly within Administration and Faculty. However, when reviewing broadly across Faculty, Administration and Staff relations, interdepartmental working relationships were viewed as Fair to Mediocre.

With respect to Compensation, Benefits & Work/Life, the result overall was positive. There was an underlying dissatisfaction with pay. Additionally, there is an overwhelming dissatisfaction with adequate staffing and resources, resulting in additional workload with no recognition. The lack of recognition spreads beyond compensation as SU's recognition and awards programs scored low nearly across all job categories.

Finally, Senior Leadership's genuine interest in campus well-being, open communication, and clear direction was the primary focus of the Faculty voice resulting in a Fair to Mediocre score. Clear direction and open communication about important matters also elicited low scores from Exempt and Nonexempt staff.

Faculty feedback was overwhelmingly a low Positive throughout the survey and presents the greatest opportunity for a job group engagement initiative.